DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 204 462 UD 021 530

AUTHOR Hawkins, John N.
TITLE Asian American Studies and Asian Studies: Interrelationships. Asian Pacific American Education Occasional Papers.
INSTITUTION National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education, Berkeley, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 80
NOTE 29p.: Not available in paper copy due to institution's restriction.
AVAILABLE FROM Asian Pacific American Research Seminars, Asian American Studies Center, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90024 (write for price).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Asian Americans; *Asian Studies; *Comparative Analysis; Cultural Interrelationships; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnic Studies; Higher Education; *International Studies; *Multicultural Education

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the possible interrelationships between Asian American Studies and Asian Studies. First, the various goals and objectives of both ethnic studies and international studies are reviewed. Then, two examples of possible interaction are discussed: (1) language acquisition study; and (2) comparative learning theory study. Two areas where Asian Studies have interacted in the past and are likely to interact in the future are also covered: precollegiate multicultural education and collegiate degree and research programs. Recommendations for improving the interaction between the two disciplines are offered. (APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JUN 9 1981

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN EDUCATION OCCASIONAL PAPERS

ED204462

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John N. Hawkins

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD021530

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR ASIAN AND PACIFIC AMERICAN EDUCATION

Asian Pacific American Research Seminars

ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES AND ASIAN STUDIES: INTERRELATIONSHIPS

John N. Hawkins

Associate Professor
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

September, 1980

This paper was prepared for the Asian Pacific American Research Seminars, a project of the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education.

The Asian Pacific American Research Seminars is supported by a grant from the National Institute of Education (NIE-G-79-0063).

Copies of this paper can be obtained from the Asian Pacific American Research Seminars, Asian American Studies Center, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90024, for $2.00 (materials are sold at cost).

ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES AND ASIAN STUDIES: INTERRELATIONSHIPS*

In this report some possible interrelationships between Asian American Studies and Asian Studies will be explored. At the outset it should be recognized that the suggestions and recommendations contained in this report are based on the experiences of this writer in working with the four NDEA area studies centers on the UCLA campus as well as with two of the ethnic studies centers (Asian-American, Chicano Studies).** In addition, a literature search was conducted through the ERIC system yielding 83 citations on the interrelationships between ethnic and international studies. These documents represent a secondary source of information on this topic. It is not possible to go into a great deal of depth regarding each of the various discussions contained in the articles and documents that were analyzed, rather, many of the points have been summarized and synthesized. Finally, interviews were conducted with selected individuals associated with the area studies centers and the ethnic studies centers, and with selected individuals from other institutions.

Background

It should be clearly recognized that ethnic studies in general and Asian American Studies in particular and international studies and Asian Studies represent two discrete entities. The literature on each of these fields as separate community, academic, and research endeavors is

---

*Portions of this report are taken from a report on international studies submitted by the author to the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, 1979.

**A list of the centers contacted is appended.

enormous (in ERIC alone the file for "ethnic" studies and "international" studies yields over 1,000 citations each for the period 1970-79). No attempt is made in this paper to do justice to the breadth and scope of these areas as separate fields of inquiry. In fact, it should be noted that there are many, in both Asian Studies and Asian American Studies, who would deny that there is, should be, or ever will be any reasonable relationship between these two areas. However, here we are simply stating for the record those aspects of both programs where some cooperation is currently being experienced and suggesting areas where more cooperation and research might be pursued in the future. In order to place this discussion in some sort of context, it will be necessary to briefly state the various goals and objectives for both ethnic studies and international studies in general before moving on to examine the various areas that have emerged as most promising for future interaction and cooperation between Asian Studies and Asian American Studies (international and ethnic studies relationships, relationship to schooling at the precollegiate level; collegiate level; the policy and research issues).

The emergence of ethnic studies during the past two decades was often characterized by an environment of political struggle and hostility toward the area by the educational establishment. Yet the fact is that many programs have survived and today are viable components of higher education. What are some of the reasons given to justify this field of inquiry; what are some of the goals and objectives? The list is quite long but here are some of the goals and objectives that seem to emerge most often. One line of reasoning places the emphasis first on providing an alternative educational experience to minority students that will

foster leadership training and develop critical thinking in the context of the students' own cultural and historical experience. Related to this is a desire to improve communication capabilities and increase scholastic motivation. By engaging in a program of study that will improve the self-image of the group in question, it is suggested that a more positive image will emerge in the community as a whole. These goals are focused on the needs of a particular ethnic group to foster its specific educational, social, and psychological needs. Another view utilizes a more integrated approach with slightly different goals and objectives. In this view the purpose of ethnic studies and/or multi-cultural programs (here we see a shift away from ethnic specific concerns) is to explore cultural and historical antecedents of ethnic groups in general for purposes of expanding the notion of the "human family." The idea here is to demonstrate how similarities transcend differences, how cultures are interdependent, and how we must develop a value system of tolerance in order to avoid sterotyping different groups and individuals. In this way, both the self-image of the individual minority group and the majority group will be enhanced. This approach cuts across ethnic boundaries and is often developed in an interdisciplinary manner. Both approaches are operationalized through programs of study, degrees, publications, community action activities, and research.

This latter approach is especially significant for Asian American Studies programs. The category "Asian American" is simply too diverse to treat as a single entity in any real way. Asian Americans comprise an extremely varied group of people with historical and cultural roots in over twenty separate nations. When Pacific Islanders are added the population diversity increases even more. Thus, a balance between

ethnic specific concerns and those of a more multicultural nature is increasingly important (Spurgin and Smith, 1973).

Similar goals and objectives can be found with respect to international or area studies. While area studies programs can be traced to a recognition that the United States was unprepared with experts and generalists for most major regions of the non-Western world there were also goals and objectives that transcended national interest. It is generally recognized in the arena of international studies that there is a need for both the area expert (a degree candidate similar to the ethnic studies degree) and the generalists (one who has had some exposure through the curriculum with studies related to a non-Western culture, similar again to students who have taken a few ethnic studies courses). Many if not most individuals associated with area studies would agree that one fundamental goal of such programs is to break out of an overemphasis on Western-oriented studies. This represents a recognition that students need to develop a greater understanding of non-Western societies, to expand understanding of other people, increase empathy, or in the words of Robert Ward, to break down "mental segregation." Area and international studies can also be viewed as being relevant to today's world, providing a degree of knowledge and understanding increasingly necessary in what some call the "global village." International literacy is beginning to be recognized as a priority area equal to mathematics and reading literacy. Again, these rather global goals and objectives are expressed through formal study programs, publications, research and community activities (termed "outreach" in this case). (Steward, 1950.)

More specifically, Asian Studies as a field of scholarly inquiry over time has focused on several interrelated issues. The case for

Asian Studies was first made in strategic, military, geopolitical and national interest terms. However, it rapidly attracted scholars and students interested in promoting cultural, economic, and technical interchange with the Asian region which in turn required increased understanding of the languages, histories and cultures of the various Asian nation-states. There was also an implied intrinsic value expressed about learning from and about the major cultural traditions in Asia. Indeed, three of the four major enduring cultural traditions have their roots in Asia (Is'am, India, the Sino-Japanese complex). The study of Asia has also concentrated on the arena of interaction and adaptation of cultures in contact which intersects with Asian American Studies and intergroup relations. Finally, proponents of Asian Studies have argued for the continuation and expansion of this field because of the need to have an informed populace regarding Asian affairs and this interest in increasing cultural understanding has been reflected curricularly in the various degree programs associated with Asian Studies nationally. (Steward, 1950.)

Insert Figure 1 About Here

The goals and objectives of ethnic studies and international studies as stated above are not significantly different although the target audience differs in each case. A major problem in developing cooperative relationships between these two areas has been the lack of a common philosophical base (at least as perceived by many in both fields of inquiry). Lacking this kind of understanding, many program directors begin with the assumption that the goals and objectives of each area

would also be mutually exclusive. Yet when engaging in a general discussion with participants in each of these areas as to their overall goals, what emerges is a set (albeit at a high level of generality) of goals that intersects in several areas. Certainly, there is enough "philosophical" overlap to engage in some limited cooperative ventures. What kinds of ventures are currently underway and what might be developed in the future?

In the sections that follow we will elaborate on five issues: 1) the general relationship between international and ethnic studies; 2) the relationship at the precollegiate level; 3) the relationship at the collegiate level; 4) policy issues; 5) research issues.

International and Ethnic Studies: Interrelationships

Early efforts to promote international studies at both the collegiate and precollegiate levels focused on the need to increase international understanding and promote the cause of world peace. Not surprisingly, this effort coincided with the end of World War I (Education for World Understanding, 1948). With the approach of World War II political pragmatism stimulated both public and private agencies to increase knowledge of the world, especially those areas considered "critical" to American public and private interests. Latin America was the first region to receive substantive attention but East, Southeast, and South Asia soon followed as being "critical" areas. Training centers and funding became available, interdisciplinary research was planned, and joint committees such as the American Council of Learned Socieities, the National Research Council, and the Social Science Research Council were formed. During and immediately following the war a number of universities and other institutions assumed responsibility for training military

personnel in language and area studies (some 60 institutions). The University Contract System (1953), the International Cooperation Administration (1955) later renamed the Agency for International Development (1961), the Peace Corps, and NDEA VI (1958) all provided a base from which international study and information was pursued and triggered proposals for international curricular content and research at both the collegiate and pre-collegiate levels. The reason for elaborating somewhat on the background to international studies is to highlight the enormous organizational base that eventually emerged, diverse in many respects but substantial nontheless (Hawkins, 1978a). It should also be noted that the rationale for international studies was not exclusively strategic but, as has been indicated above, involved an awareness of the increasing interdependence of the world (American Education, 1947). The training and research that resulted from this effort has been extremely diverse and varied but clearly a variety of research topics and areas exist that can be directly related to ethnic studies in general and Asian American Studies in particular.

Research examples from Asian Studies that might relate to Asian American Studies could be drawn from such fields as language and literature, history, sociology, and psychology. Clearly linguistic studies on first language maintenance and second language acquisition (e.g. in Malaysia, China, Indonesia, India) would be relevant for current efforts in the United States to develop policy and programs for bilingual education among first and second generation Asian Americans. For example, there is evidence that immersion in a second language in elementary school does not necessarily result in lack of maintenance in the student's first language as is commonly thought in bilingual programs in the

United States. A recent study still underway in Los Angeles substantiates this finding. Elementary level Japanese students attending the Japanese language school Asahi Gakuen are being studied to determine their level of English competence and maintainance of Japanese. Preliminary results indicate that immersion in English in the public schools does not result in a deterioration in their level of Japanese competence provided weekly lessons in Japanese are conducted at the Saturday school (Okumura, 1980). This finding challenges other studies that have been used to provide the rationale for extensive bilingual programs in the public schools. Here then is an example of an Asian Studies language research issue that is relevant for Asian American Studies concerns in bilingual education.

Another example of comparative research that is relevant for both Asian American Studies and Asian Studies focuses on alternative theories regarding learning and teaching. Here we are also dealing with conflicting pedagogical theory regarding human development (Blane and Yamamoto, 1970; Diamond and Bond, 1974).

Chinese pedagogical theory for example historically stressed the notion that the individual can be perfected or molded through formal education and training, provided it is carried out according to the criteria specified by whatever ideological (or philosophical) dictums are current. During the Confucian period classical studies and the observance of proper social relationships were paramount. There was a brief interlude of experimentation with non-Chinese educational theory and learning theory, but this stage was rapidly terminated with the establishment of the People's Republic. While there is clearly some historical and cultural continuity present, current learning and teaching

theory bear unique characteristics of the intensive efforts during the past three decades to synthesize Chinese thought and concrete circumstances with European and to some degree American educational theory. More specifically, the impact of Marxist educational theory has perhaps been the most significant development in Chinese learning and teaching theory.

A wide-ranging theoretical document written in 1937 elaborated on the fundamental stages in the acquisition and practical application of knowledge, and this statement formed the basic theoretical underpinnings for subsequent research in Chinese educational learning theory. (Mao, 1937.) Five fundamental stages were outlined:

1. Sense preception: at this stage only separate aspects of reality are perceived and more general concepts and logical conclusions cannot be drawn.
2. Conceputal stage: at this stage the individual has engaged in practical activities to the point that images pile up in his brain, experiences are repeated enough times to necessitate a cognitive leap after which concepts are formed, thus bringing knowledge to a qualitatively different and higher level.
3. Application of conceptual knowledge: the conceptual knowledge acquired in the second stage is now reapplied in a practical setting both for reinforcement and to initiate change.
4. Theory building: this stage means that the experiences gained in the previous steps result in a synthesis of concepts and experiences leading eventually to general theoretical principles for understanding social reality.
5. Adaptation to new conditions: although some theoretical principles are now clear to the individual, there are still

errors present and the dynamics of change require that the concepts and theories thus far acquired be revised in part, or at times totally.

Thus the individual's acquisition of knowledge depends on a two-way interaction of mental processes on the material world and the material world on mental processes.

The educational implications of this view are several. First, it is clear that pedagogical theory in China expresses an enormous faith in the learning ability of virtually every individual. Change and improvement in the individual's acquisition of knowledge is always possible. Recent expressions by Chinese psychiatrists reveal some elements of Pavlovian thought and references to "correct thought leading to correct processing by the mind's second signal system, which in turn leads to correct behavior" (Wallis, 1975). On the other hand, Freudian notions of the unconscious are rejected by the Chinese as being excessively concerned with the individual and the self and not compatible with the group-oriented approach currently favored in China. Another important implication is the emphasis on positive reinforcement which dominates Chinese educators' attitudes toward achievement. Although recent (1977-1980) changes will focus more on selection of students according to ability, the overall direction is likely to continue to place greater emphasis on rewarding students for what they have achieved rather than on punishment for failure to acquire certain skills. Finally, classroom observation gives one the impression that many teachers and professional educators continue to stress the concepts of learning by doing. The final test of development of learning skills is whether or not an intended outcome can be observed. If problems are revealed in an operational

sense, then the fault lies not with individual or group deficiencies but is attributed to the learning process, instructional materials, or teaching strategy. The underlying assumption here is that anything can be learned by anybody, there are not natural proclivities. Re-education may be necessary to remove undesirable attitudes or incorrect information, but once there is "correct thought" then all things are possible. Chinese educators are not unrealistic about the rapidity with which such a concept can be completely operationalized, nor are they in agreement totally on a unified theory of learning; but the basic principles of cognition expressed above are continuing to provide the principle guidelines for educators at all levels. This example of international research would have implications for research in the United States regarding intergroup relations, affirmative action, treatment of minorities in the schools and so on. Especially relevant would be studies on comparative learning theory and practice related to the newly arrived Asian Americans from Indochina and other nations in the Asian region.

These two examples--the language acquisition study and the comparative learning theory study--have been discussed in some detail to provide a clearer idea of the possible research relationships that might be identified between Asian Studies and Asian American Studies. In the concluding section of this paper several others will be suggested for future collaborative research. However, before offering more concrete policy and research suggestions there are two rather distinct areas were Asian Studies and Asian American Studies have interacted in the past and are likely to continue to interact in the future: precollegiate multi-cultural education and collegiate degree and research programs.

Relationship to schooling: Precollegiate level

At no time in the history of American education has there been a greater emphasis placed on infusing into the precollegiate curriculum concepts, materials, activities, and experiences related to the study of culture and cultural diversity. Roughly one-half of the states have mandated some form of multicultural education both for teachers (pre and in-service) and students (ethnic awareness courses, multi-cultural curricular changes, "mankind" studies, etc.), (Kimball, 1969). Teacher education institutions have also revised their curricula to include new course offerings on education and cultural diversity, have hired specialist faculty, and have engaged in a bewildering variety of "workshops" to sensitize teachers to the cultural diversity they will find in the classroom. (An Examination, 1969.) Of the many problems and criticism voiced by those engaged in these activities, one recurring topic has to do with the lack of reliable curricular materials available to the teacher and the lack of understanding of the methodologies of culture learning. Another area has been the need to effectively link ethnic/multi-cultural studies with the social science curriculum, which more often than not focuses attention on world problems. Here, it appears, is an area of inquiry almost naturally suited to a cooperative venture between those concerned with Asian American Studies and those Asian Studies centers and programs engaged in some sort of "outreach" activity (Harari, 1972; Tornez, 1972; Becker and East, 1971). Two major research goals deserve attention here: 1. the development of more effective instruments for measuring the impact of the study of culturally diverse groups, other societies, and so on, on knowledge and attitudes of both teachers and students; 2. the need to strengthen teaching about the

cultural backgrounds of Asian Americans in the United States within the broader context of examining the contributions of all to the common cultural heritage of mankind. The first goal addresses the need to provide a more articulate and convincing rationale for the introduction of international content course material in an already overcrowded curriculum. The second goal recognizes the recent emphasis on the need to provide a better fit between U.S. related Asian American concerns and the link to the "mother culture," as well as the variety of intergroup relations which occur on a worldwide scale (international education, 1971; Shane, 1969; Mohr and East, 1972). Both goals must be pursued simultaneously in order to assure that teacher preparation and instructional materials will help to extend the student's awareness of the world to include the traditions and current problems of those people who are entering more directly into their lives, while at the same time avoiding the possibility of submerging his own culture and values. One mechanism for achieving these goals could be a three-way collaborative relationship between the Asian Studies programs and specialists, Asian American Studies programs and specialists, and professional schools of education to cooperatively assess materials, develop new materials, and assist in teacher preparation. While the area approach may be considered passe by some, experience continues to demonstrate the viability of intelligently presenting teachers and students with accurate and meaningful information and experiences about regions of the world within the context of the multicultural needs of American students.

What emerges from all of this is a recognition that individuals trained in both Asian American Studies and area studies have the opportunity to apply their skills to improving curricular content and instruction in

the nation's schools and that, indeed, many are now doing so. There is a very delicate relationship which must be established between Asian American Studies, Asian Studies and professional schools of education. This effort represents a fascinating challenge to those who have dedicated their careers to increasing knowledge of and attitudes toward cultural diversity, other nations, and interdependency. Moreover, the legislative and funding framework through multicultural education and "outreach" (NDEA VI) is already in existence.

Relationship to schooling: Collegiate level

At the collegiate level it is likely that both Asian American Studies and Asian Studies programs will continue to develop academic programs, community activities, publications and research that is specific to their own unique goals and objectives. However, some administrative patterns are now beginning to emerge in both Asian American Studies programs and Asian Studies programs that will allow cooperative efforts in a few important areas. Increasingly, Asian American Studies centers are beginning to develop undergraduate and graduate (M.A.) degree programs. This move (encouraged, for example, by funding from the Ford Foundation) is an effort to respond to issues and problems identified over the past few years regarding the future viability of Asian American Studies programs in American higher educaton. Questions have been raised in the following areas: what are viable career options/patterns for graduates in Asian American Studies programs; what will be the relationship between Asian American Studies and the numerous multicultural and bilingual programs currently being developed; is there a need for both an Asian American-specific approach and a problem approach to intergroup relations; what about joint (or articulated) degree programs between Asian American

Studies centers and professional schools; can Asian American Studies centers also become qualified R & D centers for problems related to policy and practice in the intergroup arena?

With respect to many of these concerns, Asian Studies programs have already sought solutions, have gained a fair amount of experience, and may be able to offer some viable models for Asian American Studies centers to emulate. Career patterns for degree candidates in Asian Studies programs have long been of concern to professionals in these fields. One innovative effort to confront this issue is the notion of joint or articulated degree programs (at UCLA the Latin American Center for example has initiated such a program with several professional schools at the M.A. level). In a program of this type students acquire the area-specific skills (in-depth knowledge of a specific area and language) and combine these with a program of study in a professional school. In the Graduate School of Education at UCLA for example, students can be awarded a joint degree in curriculum and instruction with a focus on Latin America. This combination opens up dual career options in the field of Latin American Studies in general and in the area of curriculum development at both the collegiate and precollegiate levels. It now appears that some Asian American Studies programs are also exploring the possibility of joint degrees. One of the persistent criticisms of degree programs in Asian American Studies is that it is a dead-end curriculum. What does one do with a B.A. or M.A. in Asian-American Studies? The joint degree based on the model of the area studies centers might be one solution to this problem. A three-way cooperative effort between area studies programs, Asian American Studies programs, and professional schools might result in some interesting variations on this

theme. Degree requirements could be integrated, courses jointly developed and cross-listed, and a curriculum developed that would be academically sound and problem-oriented.

The arena of research and development offers another strong possibility for positive collaboration between these two fields of inquiry. Area Studies centers have long been identified with strong research programs, indeed some would argue that they have been overly research oriented. Nevertheless, it is also becoming apparent that Asian American Studies programs and centers are entering into research activities, fund-raising efforts, and publications programs. While it remains true that many of these research efforts will be either area or ethnic specific there may be just as many topics and issues that lend themselves to a collaborative effort. One problem in the past has been a psychological (perhaps artificial) distinction between Asian Studies and Asian American Studies. This division in perception seems to be changing and the possibility of cooperative reseach activities between Asian American and Asian Studies centers is now very real. There are many examples but two will suffice to illustrate this point. At UCLA there is currently a joint effort underway between the Asian-American Studies Center and the East Asian Studies Center to research the impact that early Chinese immigration patterns had on regions in South China. The research will be conducted in China and has interesting implications for Chinese Studies as well as for the study of Chinese-Americans. Another joint effort is in the planning stages between the Latin American Studies Center and the Chicano Studies Center. The proposed topic is to study the border region between the United States and Mexico. The range of possibilities here is very large and covers urban, ecological, epidemio-

logical and linguistic studies. With respect to Asian American Studies and Asian Studies one could imagine that the United States, including the Hawaiian Islands, border Asia through the Pacific Basin. Natural patterns of contact and immigration have occurred because of this "border effect" and studies similar to the one mentioned above could be designed (David and King, 1974; Yoshioka, 1974). This type of project not only cuts across area and ethnic lines but may involve individuals from various professional schools. It is an ideal example of the kind of interdisciplinary and cooperative effort that can develop between ethnic, area and professional studies. There are, of course, many other arenas of possible collaboration: curricular innovations, funding of joint proposals, sponsoring academic projects such as colloquia, exchanges of key staff, and so on. Obviously, the key to this kind of arrangement working is a mutual trust and respect for the academic and administrative integrity of each of the centers and programs. If this can be established then the only limitation on cooperative ventures in teaching, research, and community activities is the imagination and creativity that is applied to exploring these possibilities.

Finally, we might briefly make note of the issue of language and culture. Asian studies centers have a long history of promoting the importance of the relationship between language learning and culture learning. The model most often followed is to combine study of the history and culture of a specific region with in-depth study of one or more of the appropriate languages. While the results of this approach are still debated, many Asian Studies scholars would agree that the study of language and culture are inextricably linked (a thorough analysis of this issue is available from the USOE sponsored by Kittamugundi

Conference on Uncommonly Taught Languages). It is precisely this relationship, however, that is causing so much concern among individuals in Asian American Studies and multicultural/bilingual studies. One of the more frequently heard discussions revolves around those who are language specialists and are concerned with developing language competencies in bilingual programs, and those who believe the study of language apart from culture is meaningless. The nature of certain Asian languages (ideographic written languages such as Chinese) makes this issue even more complex. At the policy level, particularly with respect to K-12 curriculum reform, the pressure is on (at least in California and the Southwest) to integrate language and culture study. Asian American Studies centers, in collaboration with schools of education will have to respond positively. Here is another area where the experience and expertise of those in Asian Studies centers can be utilized to assist program developments among Asian American Studies centers.

Policy Issues

The interrelationship between ethnic studies and international/area studies is only beginning to emerge as a viable option. It should be stressed that this is a two-way relationship, each assisting and enriching the other depending on the particular issue being explored. From what has been said in the preceding pages, four policy recommendations might be made:

1. Efforts should be made to assist directors and program specialists from Asian American and Asian Studies to meet in a cooperative and professional environment to discuss their own goals and objectives in order to identify those areas of overlap. This will be a first step in eliminating the psycho-

logical distance between thsee two fields and will also provide a forum for developing a mutual philosophical base for future cooperation.

2. Asian American and Asian Studies programs are already having an impact on curriculum, teacher education, and in-service teacher training at the precollegiate level (through multicultural and outreach programs respectively). Incentives could be provided that would enhance cooperation and collaboration where duplication of effort has been the norm.
3. At the collegiate level, Asian Studies centers have much to offer Asian American Studies centers in the area of degree development, undergraduate and graduate curriculum design, and the notion of joint degrees. Again, a forum to mutually discuss these problems would be desirable. Jointly funded research proposals would be another aspect of cooperation at the collegiate level. Current legislation for funding research in Asian American and Asian Studies might be reassessed with this idea in mind.
4. Finally, more positive steps need to be taken to address the language and culture issue to assure that bilingual programs, language instruction, and Asian American and Asian Studies are somewhat integrated in approach and application. It seems we are working at cross purposes, for example, when a teacher desiring training in bilingual education, takes courses in an Asian Languages Department, finds the content irrelevant to the classroom situation, turns to Asian American Studies for assistance and finds they have little contact with the Asian

Language Department, and ends up in a Asian Studies outreach in-service class on history and culture. This particular example is taken from a real experience.

These policy recommendations are but a few of the many that might be made. In my opinion, they represent topics and issues where interrelationships already exist and can be made stronger and more positive. We can now turn to more specific research issues. Research Issues

In previous sections of this report several specific research examples were identified: language acquisition and maintenance; comparative learning theory; outreach programs at the precollegiate level; immigration studies; and border studies. These remain viable research topics for further exploration. However, there are a number of additional possibilities and while this list is not meant to be exhaustive I believe the topics are representative of current directions and, more importantly, they are feasiable. for convenience I have divided the topics into two clusters: cross-national transfer issues, and comparative research issues.

With respect to the first category three critical areas for research can be proposed. First, there is an on-going need to increase our knowledge about what happens when diverse cultures encounter each other. Important issues here are those that focus on cultural continuity, mutual adaptation, and cultural change. The variety of ways culturally pluralistic groups interact in the educational setting must be further explored and Asia offers unique opportunities in this area. Examples exist of caste, ethnicity, religion, and language differences. The variety of educational policy responses in nations such as Japan (Dowa education, Hawkins, 1978b); China (multinational education, Hawkins,

1978); and Malaysia (forced assimilation, Ahmad, 1980) raise issues related to the appropriateness of transferring elements of minority educational policy models to the United States and vice-versa (for example the Chinese Ministry of Education recently approved minority quotas for university admissions based on the experience in the United States). Second, transfer issues that revolve around the expanding relationship that is developing here are between Asian nations and the United States in the area of educational transfers. Total American private investment in Asia is currently $5.6 billion and an increasing share of this involves training programs, curricular packages, wholesale education construction, and soon. There is a growing desire on the part of Asian officials and business personnel to work closely with Asian Americans in further developing these relationships. Research could be proposed to study these interactions, differing management styles, personnel interactions and the like (Neaele, 1970). Research design would emphasize management theory, empirical studies, and statistical compilation. Third, Asian American M.A. degree programs could begin to move more in the direction of articulated degree programs developed in the area studies centers. One example would be an articulated degree in Asian American Studies and Management and/ or international business. Based on the situation described in point two above, Asian American international business graduates would have a unique opportunity to interact with their Asian counterparts in the arena of technology and technique transfer. There is at least one example known to this author of this effort between Chicano Studies, Latin American Studies and Latin American business (Hawkins, 1973).

Comparative research issues are perhaps the most numerous. Theoretical it would be possible to compare almost any aspect of the Asian American experience with that of the home culture. However, two broad areas come to mind each with several possible subareas contained therein. First, global education issues that concentrate on critical topics and problems are gaining increasing recognition. Recently, a number of international conferences have been held under the rubric of "global education," federal agencies have become involved, and both public and private funding is available. In this broad category we can see work being done in women and education, employment studies, social stratification, comparative child rearing and family practices, nutrition and health studies, etc., (Lai, 1978; Yoshioka, 1974; Blahe & Yamamoto, 1970). These are all issues that are of concern to scholars in Asian Studies and Asian American Studies alike. Joint, comparative research would yield a variety of important similarities and differences. Second, there is currently increasing interest in investigating comparative communication patterns and perceptions among individuals from differing cultural and historical backgrounds (Lindgren & Yu, 1975). The Japanese Ministry of Education, for example, is interested in exploring the topic of Japanese perceptions of Japanese-Americans and vice-versa, (Maykovich-Minako, 1973). Communication and perception differences among and between Asian and Asian-American is an area rich in research possibilities. One possible educational outcome would be the development of alternative, nonformal educational settings to research and document differing patterns of authority recognition, learning styles, and perceptions of school. Such studies have already been carried out on a limited scale but could be greatly increased. Furthermore, there is the likelihood that funding

would be available internationaly, especially from Japan and China but also from such multi-lateral agencies as UNESCO.

The research issues raised above are but a few of those that could be proposed. One suggestion for future conference topics sponsored by NAAPE would be to hold a series of workshops and/or panels to develop research guidelines with respect to Asian Studies and Asian American Studies. Input is needed from several sources in the two respective fields and the result might be prototype proposals for funding more specific studies. The feasilibity of forthcoming funding is increasing as federal agencies are becoming more critical of international studies programs (e.g., the GAO report on the East West Center in Honolulu) and are requiring that they concentrate more on the issues in the surrounding Asian American community. Asian American Studies and Asian Studies are both tenuous fields of inquiry--or as at least one governor has suggested--they are academic frills. By opening up a dialogue and working cooperatively it is possible that both can enhance their survival.

List of Centers Contacted

Afro-American Studies Center, UCLA

Asian-American Studies Center, UCLA

Chicano Studies Center, UCLA

East Asian Studies Center, UCLA-USC

Latin American Studies Center, UCLA

Von Grunebaum Center for Near Eastern Studies, UCLA

Ethnic Studies Center, University of Hawaii

Chicano Studies Program, California State University, Long Beach

Chicano Studies Program, Loyola Marymount University

Chicano Studies Center, University of California, Santa Barbara

Asian-American Studies Center, University of California, Berkeley

REFERENCES

Ahmad, Z. Public schooling and forced assimilation of Chinese in Malaysia. Malaysian Educational Digest, 1979.

American education and international tensions. Education Policy Commission, Washington, D.C., American Association of School Administrators, 1947.

Becker, J.M.& East, M.A.: Bloomstein, C.(Ed). Global dimensions in United States education: The secondary school. Center for War and Peace Studies. NY Friends Group, Inc., copyright 1972.

Blane, H & Yamamoto K. Sexual role identity among Japanese and Japanese-American high school students. In Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1970, I (4), 345-354.

C., Christy-Lai. Culture and control orientation: A study of internal-external locus of control in Chinese and American-Chinese women. Unpublished dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, Aug. 1978.

Diamond M. & Bond, M. The acceptance of "Barnum" personality interpretations by Japanese, Japanese-Americans, and Caucasian-American college students. In Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1974, 2 (June), 228-235.

Education for world understanding in American schools.Washington, D.C., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1948.

An examination of objectives, needs and priorities in international education in United States elementary and secondary schools. Maryland, ERIC, 1969, p30.

Harari, M. Global dimensions in United States education: The University. New York, Center for War and Peace Studies, New York Friends Group, Inc., 1972, p4.

Hawkins, J.N. Dowa education in Japan: Minority demands and institutional response. In Dowa Kyoiku, 1978, July. (a)

Hawkins, J.N. National minority education in the People's Republic of China. Comparative Education Review. 1978, Feb.,p22. (b)

Hawkins, J.N. Report on studies of Latin American studies in Los Angeles schools. 1973.

Hawkins, J.N. Teacher's resource handbook for Asian studies.University of California, 1978.(c)

International education in Ohio schools. Miami, Ohio: Department of Educational Research, Miami University, 1971.

David, K. & King, W. Review and analysis of problems of recent immigrants in Hawaii. Office of Human Resources, Honolulu, HI, 1974.

Kimball, E.A. A survey of the teaching of history and social studies in secondary schools. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

Lindgren, H. & Yu, R. Cross cultural insight and empathy among Chinese immigrants to the United States. Journal of Social Psychology. 1975, 96 (2), 305-6.

Mao Zedong. On practice. In Hsuan Chi, July 1937.

Maykovitch-Minako, K. Japanese American identity dilemma. Tokyo, Waseda University Press, 1973.

Maykovitch-Minako, K. To stay or not to stay: Dimensions of ethnic assimilation. In International Migration Review. 1976. (Fall) 10(3), 377-388.

Meade, R. Leadership studies of Chinese and Chinese Americans. In Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 1970, I (4), 325-332.

Mohr,J.J. & East, M.A. International studies of education in secondary social studies classes. A report on a survey of Colorado secondary schools. Denver, Center for Teaching International Relations, July 1972.

Okumura, F. First language maintenance, second language acquisition: The case of Japanese soujourners in Los Angeles. Dissertation proposal submitted in Los Angeles at UCLA, 1980.

Report of the Committee on the Social Studies in Secondary Education. Bureau of Education, United States Department of the Interior, Government Printing Office, Washington,D.C., 1916.

Shane, H.G. International education in the elementary and secondary schools, In The United States and International Education. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1969. p 275.

Spurgin, J.H. & Smith, G.R. Global dimensions in the new social studies. Denver, Center for the teaching of International Relations. University of Denver, 1973.

Steward, J.N. Area research, theory, and practice. New York, SSRC, 1950.

Torney, J. & Morris, D.N. Global dimensions in United States Schools: The elementary school. New York, Center for War and Peace Studies, 1972, p6.

Walls, L. & Langsley, D. Psychiatric training and practice in The People's Republic of China. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1975, 2, 121-128.

Yosioka, R. Asian-American women: Stereotyping Asian women; Chinese immigrants; Issei--The first women. Civil Rights Digest, 1974 (Spring), 6 (3), 43.53.